



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Ladies' Jews' Society," of Boston. "The American Society for meliorating the Condition of the Jews," by which "The Jewish Chronicle," at first a newspaper, now a magazine, is published monthly, was incorporated by the legislature of New York, in 1821, though it had previously existed for about five years, under another name, as "The American Society for evangelizing the Jews." In 1827, they purchased a farm at New Paltz, Ulster county, in that State, as an asylum for converted Jewish emigrants from Europe ; but they accomplished little, and sold the farm in 1835, and languished until 1841, when a new impulse was received. They now employ an active missionary in the city of New York, and a travelling agent ; and they have invited Mr. John Neander, of Cassel, in Germany, to labor, under their direction, as a missionary among the Jews of this country. Several societies, auxiliary to this, have been formed in the United States, especially in New England ; and in the summer of 1843, there was established, at Philadelphia, "The Pennsylvania Society for evangelizing the Jews," for missionary operations in that State. American evangelists in foreign lands are often able to devote some effort to the sons of Israel, who are found everywhere. Yet it must be confessed, that the church of this country has done little, far too little, for this most interesting and important object. But even the unprecedented multiplication of late, here as well as in Great Britain, of popular works respecting the Jews, manifests, what is otherwise also clearly indicated, the dawn of a brighter day for the exiled daughter of Zion.

ART. IV. — *An Introduction to the History of the Revolt of the American Colonies ; being a Comprehensive View of its Origin, derived from the State Papers contained in the Public Offices of Great Britain.* By GEORGE CHALMERS. Boston : James Munroe & Co. 1845. 2 vols. 8vo.

To write a good history or a good biography is no easy thing. He who undertakes to give an account of the transactions of the past has need of physical, moral, and mental

qualities which are seldom found combined. He should love hard study, and be able to endure it. Calmness and patience should never forsake him. He should know that nothing is to be taken on trust, and should contentedly devote days and even weeks to verify an incident that can be stated in a single line. He should sift testimony as thoroughly and weigh it as accurately as the judge upon the bench, and should know no sect in religion, and no party in politics. Since, in almost every political event of moment, he will find that some good men have been given over to obloquy and shame, and that some bad men have been elevated to distinction, he should not hesitate to declare the truth, and the whole of it, in relation to both. To popular opinion, whether past or present, he should not listen ; since to correct that opinion, whenever wrong, is an important part of his duty.

We have often heard the remark made by intelligent persons, that a man may be an eminent historian without possessing either genius or originality. We do not think so. To recast and work over again the thoughts, opinions, and reasoning of other authors is not to write history. The annalist, like the poet, is not made, but is born with an aptitude for his particular department. Thus, no one will deny to Scott great intellectual or great creative power ; but his admirers will never rest his fame on his “ *Life of Napoleon.*” Nor will any one hesitate to accord to our own Marshall reasoning faculties of the highest order ; yet few would cite the first volume of the first edition of his “ *Life of Washington,*” as the best work on our Colonial annals.

The book before us was written by an able, honest, labor-loving, but strongly prejudiced, loyalist. George Chalmers, we venture to say, was never so happy as when delving among state papers. He had official concern with those of England for nearly half a century, and he used them for the composition of several valuable works upon British and American history. He wrote from the best sources of information, and his productions are entitled to consideration and respect. His “ *Political Annals of the United Colonies* ” is esteemed, and has been quoted and relied upon as good authority almost universally. His “ *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots* ” shows the ardor and zeal which he could bring to bear upon a favorite object. It is the plea of an advocate, to prove from official documents, that this unfor-

fortunate daughter of the Stuarts was innocent of the murder of her second husband ; and most manfully and earnestly did he perform the task.

The "Introduction to the History of the Revolt of the American Colonies" was meant to serve a particular end, and implicit faith, therefore, is not due to the author's statements. His general fidelity we do not dispute ; but his antipathies were strong, and they sometimes led him to unfair conclusions. He disliked the principles of the people of New England, and seldom mentions them without showing his prejudices. He liked the Virginians, takes pains to extenuate their faults, and attributes their final defection to the ever-present, ever-mischievous influence of "the levellers" of the North. He lived in Maryland in the early part of his life, and he remembers that Colony in kindness, and speaks of it often in terms of affectionate interest. He sees designs to throw off the yoke of colonial vassalage in the common and every-day disputes of parties formed for temporary purposes, and in the struggles, constantly taking place among a people who were already free, to carry out special measures, or to obtain place and power. He expresses his opinions frankly and fully, and, we doubt not, with entire sincerity. His views upon the question of independence are certainly wrong, as applied to the Middle and Southern Colonies ; and, as regards those of the North, in the absence of recorded proof by the New England people themselves, there will ever be a difference of belief in respect to the facts and circumstances relating to this point, that are furnished by their documentary history and by other evidence. Mr. Sparks has examined the subject with his usual care and ability, and has arrived at the conclusion, that separation from the mother country was not desired by any of the Colonies while hope of redress remained. Such is the opinion of American authorities very generally ; but it is known, that some who have devoted themselves to the inquiry have arrived at opposite conclusions.

Chalmers often laments and severely rebukes the inattention, weakness, and ignorance which prevailed in the councils of England with regard to her American Colonies ; and few who administered her affairs during the period of which he treats escape his censure. On many occasions, when British subjects of all classes at home were alarmed at the

origin or progress of some particular branch of Colonial industry, or appealed to the government to protect them from the effects of transatlantic skill or enterprise, he complains, that the ministers, who should have been most active, remained passive spectators of the wrong which it was their duty to correct. He complains, also, because such frequent concessions were made to the Colonists, in matters which touched their civil rights rather than their pursuits, and because there was no settled system for their general government. Indeed, the leading principle or doctrine of the work seems to be, that the Colonies were allowed far too much freedom, and that their final independence was the natural result of continued and ill-advised indulgence. In other words, he thinks that carelessness and kindness, and not extreme watchfulness and undue severity, were the causes of their "revolt." In his view, the American subjects had but few grievances to redress at any time ; but having learned, at an early period of their history, that turbulence, clamor, and tumult were sure to obtain any object which they desired, they grew refractory just in proportion to their success, and to their increase in numbers and advance in wealth. To trust the wayward people of New England to their own guidance, to listen to their representations, to heed their hypocritical canting when molested, to allow their evil example to corrupt and alienate the other Colonists, was a remissness of duty, which he often mentions as having produced the most fatal consequences.

The policy, which prevailed in the time of George the Second, of appointing native governors, and that which originated in an earlier reign, of commissioning one person to be chief ruler of several Colonies, meet with his unqualified condemnation. In the collisions which occurred between the servants of the king and the popular assemblies, his sympathies are generally with the former ; and of the many disputes which he notices, he certainly admits but one in which the delegates of the people were "altogether right," and the royal representative "altogether wrong." He admires the skill and vigor evinced by the statesmen of France in governing her American possessions, and attributes her greater success in ruling them to the simpler form of her colonial government, and to the greater talents and more exact obedience which she required in the officers placed at

the head of affairs. In a word, energy and uniform firmness in executing the system, adopted in Europe, for administering the affairs and retaining the dependence of distant possessions would have insured to England and her Colonies a permanent and a happy connection with each other.

The style of Chalmers is concise and vigorous, but is deficient in simplicity, clearness, and finish. He designed to inform political men about political events, rather than to please and amuse the general reader ; and the meaning which he intended to convey respecting the origin and progress of Colonial disaffection is usually obvious ; but the sense of other passages is not always easily ascertained. He was fond of short and pithy expressions of opinion ; but what he thus meant for maxims are not always beautiful or sound.

Chalmers rests from his labors, and this fact alone would be sufficient to deter us from passing any severe criticism upon his work, devoted, as it principally is, to topics on which men may conscientiously differ, did it deserve such treatment at our hands, or were we disposed to undertake the task. But there are portions of it which we cannot suffer to pass without notice, and without expressing our earnest and pointed dissent from the opinions therein conveyed. These portions relate principally to New England, especially to Massachusetts ; and from the extracts we now proceed to make, our readers will perceive, we think, that common justice is done to neither.

“ New England was at length planted by accident, after several expensive efforts had failed. A few fanatics, who, tired of the European world, because it denied to them that toleration which they showed little inclination to allow to others, sailed for Virginia, but were driven by storm on the coast of New England. Here they determined to end a disastrous voyage, since the approach of winter, as well as their distresses, forbade further adventure. But sagacity soon discovered, that he who appears to be animated with the fervors of religion may at the same time be actuated by the most ardent ambition.” — Vol. I., pp. 26, 27.

We shall enter upon no defence of religious intolerance ; it is a stain upon the memory of all who have practised it. But history should be just, and we may therefore notice, once for all, the many unkind allusions of Chalmers to whatever of it existed among the founders of the Northern Colo-

nies. It may not have been right to establish Congregationalism in Massachusetts by law ; but it was quite as justifiable as the act of establishing Episcopacy by the same authority in his favorite Colony of Virginia. To refuse the exercise of civil rights to clergymen who had not received church-ordination was quite as inexcusable in the latter as to insist upon church-membership as a qualification for enjoying the same privileges was in the former. It was a great wrong for Puritans to banish Quakers and Baptists ; but it was equally wrong for Churchmen to banish Puritans. Calvert laid the foundations of religious freedom in Maryland broad and deep ; but of what faith were those who overturned the structure which that noble man had built, and who, alike regardless of charter and individual rights, declared that persons of his communion were beyond the pale of British protection ? When so many were guilty, it is dangerous to accuse one.

In this connection, we may also notice the frequent charge, that the religion and politics of these “ fanatics ” were inseparably connected. If they found comfort in the Bible, we rejoice at it ; for men so weary and sorrowing needed all the consolation which it could impart. If they held that those who followed them to their place of exile, and who assumed to direct all their movements, were bound by its precepts, and if they quoted these precepts in order to shield themselves from oppression, who shall rebuke them ? We might plead their cause after their own fashion, if custom and taste had not so changed, as to make those arguments appear puerile now, which seemed most cogent in their ears. When they read that “ in *all* labor there is profit,” and “ he that laboreth laboreth *for himself*,” they might well plead the authority of Scripture against their fellow-subjects who sought to restrain their pursuits and seize upon the rewards of their enterprise. The exclamation of Paul, “ I was free-born,” saved him from the scourge ; and the oft-repeated declarations of those who were “ fanatically ” attached to his teachings should have saved them from the infliction of the colonial system. They, like him, appealed to Cæsar ; and if his ear had not been poisoned, when they had forced their way to his throne, far less would have been written against either their religion or their politics. The historian, who says, that, in a

synod of New England churches, "Vane, the younger,* learned the arts of low intrigue, of mean dissimulation, which he not long after practised on a greater stage" ; who speaks of "recitals of Scriptural jargon," of "pious arts," of "profound hypocrisy," as applicable to these churches, pastors, or people, is unfaithful to his duty, and careless of his fame. The Puritans were stern and severe, and so were most persons of their time ; but distempered separatists in the beginning, or a community of canting, ambitious hypocrites afterwards, they were not.

In speaking farther of the settlers of Plymouth, he calls them "Brownists," and avers that their "unsociable religion, which cannot easily be described, promoted altercation and excluded emigrants." Annalists favorable to New England seldom fall into the error of saying, that the Puritans who fled from England to Holland, and thence embarked for America, were followers of Robert Brown. The principles of that sectary were quite different in many particulars from those embraced by the flock of Mr. Robinson ; and finally Brown himself abandoned them, and returned to the bosom of the church from which he had seceded. The class of dissenters, known in the early period of separation as "Independents," is that to which the Pilgrim fathers distinctly belonged ; and we regret, that, among the writers who have not preserved the distinction that relieves them from the odium of opinions and practices highly reprehensible, is Judge Marshall.

"Meanwhile a new race of men appeared in America, whose peculiar principles will be found, when traced through all their various effects, to have entailed on the colonies numberless woes, on the parent country the most perplexing embarrassments.

"The example of the Brownists of New Plymouth, whose persevering diligence had conquered difficulties, inflamed the spirit of adventure, by teaching men to despise disease and death, when they propagated their tenets or sought for gain. And zealots associated to plant the gospel in New England, at a

* Many of our own writers are unjust to Sir Henry Vane. It is the opinion of so competent a judge as the late Sir James Mackintosh, that he was one of the most profound thinkers who ever lived, and scarcely inferior to Bacon. His life, by the Rev. Charles W. Upham, in Sparks's *American Biography*, is an admirable production, and has done much towards disseminating correct views of his real character and merits.

time when many minds were filled with religious fury or political Puritanism. Having determined to transfer to others what they could not plant themselves, the great Plymouth Company granted a considerable tract of that country, which they had been unable to people, in which they could not even possess their envied monopoly, because they had found the fishers sturdy men when invigorated by the support of Parliament. And, in March, 1627-8, they readily conveyed to Rosewell and his associates an extensive territory lying around Massachusetts Bay, with such powers of government as they could communicate to others. Urged by their zeal, this association soon detached Endicott thither as their agent, with a few planters and servants, in order to form a settlement, which acquired its name from the arm of the sea whereon it was placed; 'where non-conformists might enjoy the liberty of their own persuasion.' " — Vol. 1., pp. 39, 40.

The people of the North "entailed no woes" upon their fellow-subjects in America; they involved England in no "perplexing embarrassments." But the mother country, by continual interference with their industry, wore out their power of endurance. Taunted, in the spirit of the work before us, for a century and a half, with the heresy of their faith, and impeded in all their enterprises ever after the death of Cromwell, they invoked the sympathy of their Colonial brethren whose religion and pursuits were favored objects of her regard; and when their joint appeals to her justice and magnanimity failed to shake her purposes, then, by the union of counsel, arms, and effort, all the Colonies together broke from her dominion. If the war of the Revolution had its origin in a long course of aggression upon the rights of the North, its successful issue was due in some measure to the more meritorious, because more disinterested, exertions of the South. If the "peculiar principles" of New England, which our author so frequently and bitterly reproaches as the causes of all imaginable ills, were gradually diffused throughout the country, so that Episcopal and monarchical Virginia at last furnished a commander for the Puritan and republican soldiers of Massachusetts, we are led to infer, that the wrongs which united men of such different characters and pursuits were far too deep and grave to be excused or extenuated; and therefore, that the book before us, able, earnest, and honest, as we concede it to be, is an utter failure for all the purposes for which it was designed. War is ever a

sad event ; and it is especially sad, and humanity and Christianity are doubly grieved, whenever it is waged between brethren. The contest between England and her Colonies should not have happened. The mother should have arranged terms of separation from her children in peace and kindness. A simple treaty, stipulating for commercial advantages for a term of years, would have secured to her every thing that she desired, or could have obtained by a continuance of the connection. The errors of the past cannot be mentioned too often ; for it is by the remembrance of them that wisdom is gained to direct communities for the future.

“ We must carefully distinguish between the emigrants of 1620 and those of 1630, if we would form an accurate judgment of the founders of New England. In one characteristic, indeed, they both agreed, as they were all Puritans of the most rigid kind. The settlers of New Plymouth appear to have been men of great zeal with little knowledge, who exerted an industry and perseverance prompted by their indigence.

“ The principal planters of Massachusetts were English country-gentlemen of no inconsiderable fortunes ; of enlarged understandings, improved by liberal education ; of extensive ambition, concealed under the appearance of religious humility. The ecclesiastics of the first were at once ignorant and enthusiastic. The clergy of the second, having derived their scholastic knowledge from Oxford and from Cambridge, possessed rather more than a competent share of learning, which they did not, however, bequeath to their successors : and, having found objections to the church of England, of which they had been members, in the innovations of the age, endeavoured to discover the truth in every extreme. The savage vulgarity of both classes gave them considerable influence over the minds of the multitude ; whose manners they formed, whose inclinations they directed, to that love of equality, that impatience of restraint, which strangers in after times attributed to a ‘ levelling principle.’ And to this source may be traced up the genuine causes of the various events of their annals ; of those that are already past, of those that are yet to be mentioned.” — Vol. I., pp. 57, 58.

And this was meant to convey to posterity a correct account of those who came to found New England ! The settlers of Plymouth were not, as is here asserted, persons of “ little knowledge.” Brewster, who was educated at an English University, who was remarkably well versed in the

ancient languages, and who had been the friend and counselor of a favorite minister of Elizabeth, was certainly an accomplished man. Governor Bradford was a writer of merit, and a proficient in the Dutch, French, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages, while his acquirements in history, politics, and philosophy were very respectable. Edward Winslow possessed rare qualifications as a statesman, and his literary productions are still consulted with pleasure. Fuller was regularly bred to the practice of medicine, and was distinguished for professional knowledge and skill. Allerton was an intelligent and active merchant, and was often intrusted with public business of great importance to the Colony. These names are quite sufficient to repel the imputation ; but others could be added, were it necessary.

It is next asserted, that the "ecclesiastics were at once ignorant and enthusiastic." Their enthusiasm we shall not undertake to deny ; but we are by no means disposed to admit that they were deficient in learning. Among the clergy of the infant Colony were Smith, Roger Williams, Lathrop, Norton, and Patridge, all of whom, the first excepted, were educated at one of the ancient seats of English learning. From Plymouth, also, were Dunster and Chauncy, the first and second presidents of Harvard University, both of whom filled the station with usefulness and honor. It was the privilege of the former to direct and mature the opening mind of Sir George Downing, whose part in devising the celebrated Navigation Act will insure perpetual mention of his name, either for praise or censure, in the commercial annals of the world. Of Chauncy it may be remarked, that he had been Professor of Greek and Hebrew at Cambridge in England, and had enjoyed the most intimate relations with Usher, who is said to have been "the first scholar in Europe." In truth, the only ignorant clergyman in the Colony, whom we have ever heard of, was dismissed on account of his deficiencies.

As it is conceded, that the pastoral care of the churches of Massachusetts, within its ancient limits, did not devolve upon ignorant teachers, we need make no inquiry into this part of the subject ; but as the clergymen of both Colonies are accused of "savage vulgarity," it may be worth while to say a word about their character and manners. Wilson, the first minister of Boston, was the relative of an archbishop,

and as he was "chaplain in several honorable families" while in England, his manners were probably formed among gentlemen. The harsh language of Chalmers is ill-suited to describe the mild Cotton, the Melancthon of the New World; or the heavenly-minded Hooker, the grave and pure Higginson, the apostolic John Eliot, or the first of the Mathers. Its application would be wholly unjust to Bulkley, Sherman, the Allens, Rogers, and many other clergymen who accompanied the early emigrants. It would be very remarkable, if so many Englishmen, trained at the best institutions of the realm, most of them being of gentle parentage, who were in holy orders, and had mingled in polished society, had been persons of bad breeding. Chalmers's censure would not be just, even if it were written of Hugh Peters, the most exceptionable of them all.

Shute came out to Massachusetts, charged by Addison, who was then a minister of state, "to suffer no publications, nor even the existence of a printing-press, without his license"; but the printers of Boston paid but little heed to the command, and after an ineffectual attempt to restrain them, the contest was given up by the officers of the crown. Chalmers thus announces the fact.

"It is from the year 1719, that we ought to date the freedom of the press; which, thenceforth, poured forth its libels, numerous and virulent, in proportion to the late restraint, without distributing, as an antidote, the productions of genius or the warnings of morality." — Vol. II., p. 20.

This passage begins in error, and ends in a lamentable perversion of truth. The press did not become free at the period stated, nor for a considerable time afterwards. In the early part of 1719, it was deemed necessary to obtain license from Shute to publish a pamphlet upon the very harmless subject of providing Boston with market-houses, of which the town was then destitute;* while censorship of the newspapers continued to be enforced so rigidly, that, four years after, matter intended for publication in them was required to be examined by the Colonial secretary. Though no particular officer may have been charged with the duty of supervision later than the year 1730, a publisher was sent to

* Dr. Colman published a sermon on the reasons for a market in Boston, in 1719.

prison in 1754, upon suspicion of having printed remarks derogatory to some members of the Colonial government.* About the year last mentioned, as the Bible could not be lawfully printed here, an edition of it — the first one published in America in the vernacular tongue — was privately put forth from an office in “Prison Lane”; † it bore the London imprint, and a close resemblance to one of the editions published by the favored printers “at home,” who enjoyed a monopoly by patent from the crown.

Of a far graver character is the statement which concludes the paragraph. We deny its correctness, and aver that the ante-revolutionary press of Massachusetts was not licentious, but, on the contrary, that it was remarkably pure. It is true, that, “in proportion to the late restraint,” it did pour forth sermons and essays in great profusion; and it is true, also, that, for the half century preceding the controversies which terminated in dismembering the British empire, the number of publications upon various subjects in Massachusetts was nearly equal to the whole number ever issued in any of the other Colonies. But as the habit of obtaining books from England could not be suddenly changed upon the breaking down of an odious ordinance, as adequate supplies of paper and types of domestic manufacture could not be had, and as the printers were generally too poor to import the materials necessary for executing large and expensive works, few of this sort were published. But since there was certainly one edition of the Scriptures complete, and one or more of the New Testament separately, one of the Psalter of thirty

* It may not be without interest to show what was thought of the freedom of the newspaper press thirty or forty years ago. In February, 1812, the attorney-general and solicitor-general of Massachusetts state, in an official report to Governor Gerry, that, in their judgment, there had appeared in the Boston papers, since the preceding 1st of June, no less than *two hundred and fifty-three libellous articles*; to wit, in *The Scourge*, 99; *The Centinel*, 51; *The Repertory*, 34; *The Gazette* 33; *The Palladium*, 18; *The Messenger*, 1; *The Chronicle*, 8; and *The Patriot*, 9; while in *The Yankee* there had been none. The dates of the papers are given, and the libellous matter is divided into two kinds; that in which the truth could be, and that in which it could not be, given in evidence to justify the party accused. These law officers state, moreover, that their examinations had not embraced complete files of all of these prints; that they had not included in their list calumnious publications against foreign governments or distinguished foreigners, or libels of the editorial brethren against each other. It appears that the inquiry was instituted at his Excellency's request.

† Court Street.

thousand copies, a number of the versifications of Watts and other psalmists, and a variety of books for schools and for the improvement of youth, most men will agree with us in believing, that something was done to diffuse both "the productions of genius" and "the warnings of morality."

And further ; our staunch loyalist, in his desire to inflict a blow upon his political foes, wounds those of his own party. We could not expect him to praise Dummer's defence of the New England charters ; nor the essays of Cooke, who led the "levellers" until he was worn out and broken down with the toils and anxieties of his position ; nor the later writings of Otis, Quincy, Oxenbridge Thacher, Chauncy, and Cooper ; but we might have looked for some favorable notice of the labors of Hutchinson, Auchmuty, and other writers of the same class. Within the period of which he speaks, there were in New England upwards of one hundred and forty authors on subjects of theology, history, science, and politics, of whom the greater part belonged to Massachusetts. A large majority of them were clergymen of distinguished talents and learning. As Cutler, Hooper, Apthorp, and others of Episcopal ordination, whose discourses or disquisitions are preserved, were among them, a less prejudiced writer would have made a more liberal and a more truthful record.

The remarks of Chalmers upon the expedition against Cape Breton are too long to be transferred entire to our pages. Their general tone, however, may be inferred from the extracts which follow. We ought to say, that, unlike some other writers of the time, he does not claim the whole glory of success for the British fleet that coöperated with the land forces of the Colonists.

"Three thousand volunteers were easily raised, since they were promised the plunder ; and the aid of the other colonies was, meanwhile, asked, because they were all equal interested in an enterprise which offered equally security to all. Pepperell, a respectable merchant, who had courted fortune with too much diligence to find leisure to study the art of war, who, by the probity of his dealings, had, however, acquired popularity among his countrymen, was appointed commander-in-chief. Every colony which sent a quota of troops gave him a separate commission, because all were equally independent and neither was supreme.

.

“ In April, 1745, Pepperell arrived before Louisburg, whose fortifications were mouldering into dust, whose defenders were mutinous for want of pay. He was aided by an English fleet under Warren, whose early blunders were covered by ultimate triumph. Pepperell gave a lesson to officers regularly bred to the profession of arms, by attacking the defences where they were least able to resist, without any technical delays or any of the refinements of art. And pressed by assaults, vigorous yet tumultuary, the garrison capitulated, when they saw the numbers of their assailants daily increase at the same time that their own resources were cut off by the capture of their ships within sight of the ramparts. But difficulties occurred during this happy moment which seem not to have been foreseen, though they naturally sprang out of the defects of a jurisdiction unequal to the object. Whether the keys should be delivered to Pepperell or to Warren, whether the general or the admiral was entitled to command, were questions which their prudence easily resolved into compromise. And both received the signs of submission and each alternately issued his orders. Disappointed as to the promised plunder, the New-English soldiers proposed to divide the country among themselves, as the sailors exercised the exclusive privilege of despoiling the Spaniards. With arms in their hands, it was not easy to prevent their purposes, since, from their fathers, they had learned to yield little reverence to authority.

“ Knowles, who succeeded Warren as governor, remarked to the Duke, in July, 1746, ‘ that the first accounts received by your Grace of the strength and importance of Louisburg were written while success warmed the breast, and then zeal is apt to run into enthusiasm ’ ; that, owing to the continuance of fogs and the frosts, the labor of twenty years and the expense of a million would not put the works in a defensible state of repair against a vigorous attack. The conquerors carefully published to the world the advantages and the glory of the conquest, while the honest remonstrances of Knowles were carefully concealed by those who hoped for fame from the actions of others. And the nation was taught to rejoice at an event that seemed to give a momentary lustre to the most unsuccessful of wars.” — Vol. II., pp. 238 – 241.

As the circumstances which attended the fall of the strongest fortress in America are so familiar to all readers of our annals, we shall stop to make but few remarks upon these extracts. Its capture, as several English writers admit, gave England favorable terms of peace, though our author evi-

dently regards it as of little consequence. His account appears both unsatisfactory and unfair. It was new to us, that the fortifications were in a ruinous condition before the siege. Pepperell and Warren, in their joint despatch to the minister, represent them as being "very strong," and as having exceeded "their most extended apprehensions." Whether Knowles spoke the exact truth respecting their dilapidated state in 1746 is immaterial ; because the nine thousand cannon-balls and six hundred bombs, which were fired into them during the forty-nine days occupied in the siege, in 1745, probably did them some injury ; and shattered masonry, exposed to the weather for a whole year, does not improve in appearance or strength. We never heard that the soldiery were promised "the plunder," or that Louisburg contained any "Spaniards" to be plundered. The official papers of Shirley, Pepperell, and Warren make no mention of such a promise made or broken ; and as Cape Breton was a French colony, it may be supposed that its capital city was inhabited by Frenchmen.

"And to the New-English was repaid the expense of the capture, amounting to £ 183,649, in order to encourage their future efforts, as they had convinced the world of their power. But it was only remarked by the few, that it was of little consequence to the state whether her battles were fought by the Swiss or the Hessians, by the Russians or Americans, if she paid for their services as mercenaries, rather than received their contributions as subjects." — Vol. II., p. 241.

"To the colonies, who had now learned to barter their services for gold, Britain repaid the fruitless expense, amounting to £ 235,817 ; which enriched them in the same proportion that it impoverished her." — p. 244.

"The parliament granted to this colony, as its share of reimbursement for the capture of Cape Breton, £ 183,000 of real money, which probably was a greater sum than Massachusetts had spent of real wealth during the war." — p. 246.

"The New-English alone, of all the colonists, appear to have engaged in the contest with zeal, because they had learned to enrich themselves by exchanging their military services for substantial gold ; by acting as the mercenaries rather than the subjects of a great empire." — p. 253.

The expedition against Louisburg was a crusade. The eloquent Whitefield furnished the motto for the flag, many

of his disciples enlisted under it, and a strong religious zeal was universally awakened in behalf of the undertaking. It was the boldest and most successful enterprise mentioned in our Colonial history, and there is not a particle of evidence to show, that it was projected from the desire of pecuniary reward. True, the amount expended was reimbursed ; and why should it not have been, when England, for equivalents in Europe of no possible benefit to the Colonies, restored the city and the island on which it was situated to France, its former possessor ? But whoever is led, from the passages which we have quoted, to suppose that the "reimbursement" was promptly and willingly made, may learn what delays and difficulties were encountered in prosecuting the claim from the correspondence of Bollan, the agent of Massachusetts. The sum at length obtained was considerable ; but the retention of Cape Breton by England would have been of far more consequence to the maritime Colonies than was the amount which they received for its conquest ; nor did they ever recover from the dissatisfaction which its restoration caused.

" In December, 1722, Shute departed suddenly for England, because, knowing that the numbers and the virulence of his enemies increased, he feared for his personal safety. That they should have forced from his station a governor, whose religion was congenial with their own, whose talents were unequal to any purpose of encroachment, whose moderation was satisfied with a petty and precarious maintenance, is a singular proof of their principles. He was one of those well-meaning men, who in private life gain some respect because they are harmless ; but he possessed not even the minute diligence which enables men of little parts to transact great affairs ; and the Board of Trade repeatedly threatened to lay his neglectful conduct before the king, since they received from the newspapers the earliest and best accounts of his province. He had scarcely departed, when the representatives, in characteristic language, declared, ' that they were not conscious of having given any cause for the governor's withdrawing in this unheard-of way.' And they prepared, by their agents, to make a vigorous defence against the accusations, which they knew it was his purpose to lay before their common sovereign." — Vol. II., pp. 25, 26.

The political contests of Shute's time were more bitter, probably, than any which occurred before the administra-

tion of Bernard. The two great subjects of dispute related to a fixed salary for the chief magistrate, and to the pine-trees reserved by the charter for the use of the royal navy ; * but our limits will not allow us to consider either. We avail ourselves of this passage only to notice generally the blindness of our author to the real causes of Colonial complaints. He seldom seems to have considered, that the royal governors were intrusted with the execution of commands which the Colonists regarded as infringing their most important rights, and that this circumstance sufficiently explains many of the long and bitter controversies which arose between them. Nor does he appear to have attached due weight to the fact, that another cause of dissatisfaction might be found in the conduct, character, or qualifications of the governors themselves. He admits, in a preceding passage, that Shute's "natural imbecility," and other reasons, disqualified him for the station to which he was appointed, and the same admission is substantially repeated in the extract before us ; but he still finds the causes of this governor's discomfiture in the "principles" of the people whom he was sent to govern.

Chalmers would have had the Colonists respect and obey the representatives of the king, even if they were madmen or fools. In his judgment, contempt for the servants of the crown was proof of contempt for the crown itself. In the struggles of the popular assemblies against the will of arbitrary functionaries, as we have already remarked, he often saw designs of independence. But, by his own account, it is evident that many who were intrusted with the performance of executive duties were entirely incompetent for their office, either from deficiency of talent, defects of temper, or want of knowledge of Colonial affairs. Thus, Schuyler, in his opinion, was a well meaning man, but of small intellect ; Montgomery had neither mental vigor nor bodily activity ; Cosby was violent, self-willed, and committed great public wrongs on the most frivolous pretexts. He says that the predecessors of Spotswood, in Virginia, were destitute of qualifications for their office, and that Drysdale, the successor of Spotswood, was a weak and inferior officer. The elevation of a miller to the dignity of lieutenant-governor of

* Some account of the disputes under the second head may be found in an article on "The Forest Lands and Timber Trade of Maine," *N. A. Review*, Vol. LVIII., p. 299.

New Hampshire, as he considers, was a continuance of the careless and feeble policy which had formerly conferred the same honor on a carpenter. He denies to Everard the possession of either talents or virtue, and accuses Barrington of having shown neither honesty nor ability. Hardy and Clinton were both seamen, and men of ordinary minds, while the former was deficient in discretion. Sothell practised every crime ; Gooken was weak ; Keith, artful and faithless ; and Gordon, old and imbecile. Such rulers, not to mention others who might be added, and without including those of the revolutionary era, show that sufficient reasons for discontent and violent altercations existed, independent of the principles of the Colonists. Chalmers quotes the remark, as a shrewd saying, that "the proprietary governor has two masters ; one who gives him his commission, and one who gives him his pay ; and he is, therefore, on his good behaviour to both." Some of these dignitaries, we suspect, cared very little for either of their two masters ; and he who remarked, that they had *three* things to attend to, "First to fleece the people for the king, then for themselves, and lastly for the proprietaries their employers," told more truth, and had more wit, than the person cited by our well informed but strongly prejudiced annalist.

"In November, 1724, the ship-carpenters of the river Thames complained to their sovereign, 'that their trade was hurt, and their workmen emigrated, since so many vessels were built in New England.' West, the truly judicious and candid counsel of the Board of Trade, gave it as his opinion, 'that, though their grievance may be well founded, they might as well complain of ship-building at Bristol, because the acts of navigation had declared the plantation-built ships should be deemed English.' Yet the honest carpenters were wronged, though they could not explain how. Their injury resulted from a circumstance illegal and unjust ; that the ships of the Chesapeake, the Delaware, and Massachusetts were respected in the Thames as British, while the river-built vessels were regarded in Massachusetts, in the Delaware, and in the Chesapeake, as foreign. The Board reported, what ought to have roused the ministers of a naval nation, 'that they had good reason to believe the number of shipwrights in Britain had diminished one half since 1710 ; owing to the great number of ships annually built in the plantations, which being sold cheaper, few ships are now contracted for here ;' and, considering the importance of so useful a body of

men, they proposed, as the least exceptionable expedient, to lay a duty of five shillings the ton on plantation-built ships employed in the foreign trade of England." — Vol. II., pp. 33, 34.

The jealousy here spoken of existed half a century earlier ; and Child, the great commercial authority of his time, pointed out the dangers to be apprehended from the growth of Colonial shipping in 1670. But as we propose to consider this subject in another place, we notice this passage merely to say, that the project of taxing "plantation-built ships" has been revived quite lately. There appears to be a strong party in England favorable to the measure, and the design is urged with no little zeal, as the best means of preventing the unwelcome competition of the ships of the North American Colonies with those built in the British isles. The evil consequences of attempting to interfere with the maritime enterprise of Massachusetts and the other Northern Colonies, a century ago, would be sufficient, we think, were there no other reasons, to prevent the adoption of the plan. The relations of England with her possessions on this continent are not of that close and amicable nature, at the present time, which would make taxation safe in any form, and least of all would a tax upon ships be submitted to without earnest and angry complaints. The Colonists are already sufficiently aggrieved, they imagine, with the long continued endeavours to exclude their vessels from the best employments, on account of alleged inferiority of material, construction, and equipment. We invite the attention of the ship-owners of the United States to this and every similar proposal calculated to affect their interests. Every Colonial ship excluded from the ports of England is likely to seek an American cotton-mart, or otherwise interfere with our own vessels in the carriage of our products.

"Observing that the New-English, blessed with no native staple, carried on a circuitous commerce, by transporting to foreign nations the tobacco of the continent and the sugar and dyeing-woods of the islands, the parliament [in 1672], partly in order to check that disadvantageous traffic, but more to subject the colonists to the same duties which British residents had long been compelled to pay, imposed various taxes on the export of such commodities as the plantations then only produced. Placed under the superintendence of the treasury, those duties were directed to be levied in the colonies by the same officers, under the

same power as the customs were already collected in England. The Restoration having put a period to every term of exemption, the acts of tonnage and poundage having never been enforced in America, the present measure formed the seed-plot, on which was raised the subsequent system of colonial revenue; which, however, grew up stunted and unpromising, because its progress was obstructed, since the law was eluded.

“The governors had been the most early custom-house officers. Though they were paid, however, specific salaries for executing the laws of navigation, they acted feebly, perhaps dishonestly, since the Privy Council threatened them with punishment, not for acting weakly, but for acting wrong. Regular custom-houses were not long after erected successively in the colonies, though not on the extensive plan of modern times. The revenue officers were received, in different provinces, with kindness or with opposition, as the provincial principles led them to regard England with reverence or with jealousy. The assemblies of Virginia and of Maryland recognized ‘the collectors’ as legal officers; distinguishing between ‘country dues and parliamentary customs.’ But we shall find the collector opposed in New England with every circumstance of cunning and force. From that period there has existed, in colonial policy, a twofold collection of taxes on imports and exports; the provincial duties, established by the assemblies, and collected by the naval officers; the subsidies, granted by Parliament, and levied by the collectors. What can be more remarkable, than the rapid progress with which the commerce of the plantations has advanced to real greatness! Nothing can be more striking than the fact, that, though customs have, from time to time, been imposed on their traffic in its exaltation, the income arising from them did not, at the expiration of a century from the introduction of custom-house officers, amount to more than three-and-thirty thousand pounds. The year 1676 may be regarded as the epoch when the collectors of revenue were first sent thither under parliamentary sanction.* In 1776, they were formally expelled by a body of men, who regarded themselves as the representatives of the colonists, convened in a congress.” — Vol. I., pp. 125–127.

Having, on a former occasion,† expressed our conviction, that the Navigation Act, and the laws of trade, which were a part of the system it was meant to enforce, contained the germ of the American Revolution, we do not propose to

* “The colonial income, arising from that system of finance, yielded, in 1677, £803. 2s. 8d.”

† *N. A. Review*, Vol. LVII., p. 293.

discuss that subject now. But we wish to show more fully than Chalmers has done how abortive was the effort to fasten that system upon the Colonies, even in the days of their infancy and weakness. Colonial commerce was originally free ; and Massachusetts, foremost in all maritime enterprises, not only traversed the ocean at will, but established a plan of revenue, appointed a collector of her customs, and exacted fees of vessels arriving at her ports. She also entered into an arrangement for commercial intercourse with Canada, or New France. And it is worthy of remark, that her policy, thus early developed, recognized the great principle of discrimination among the articles to be taxed, which formed the basis of our system at the organization of the present national government. The trade of Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island was small ; though, from a letter of Roger Williams, it appears, that it was designed to send a ship from the latter Colony to the East Indies. New England generally was not prepared to receive or obey any statute that should restrain her adventures upon the sea. When the collector arrived at Boston, he found the merchants there engaged in an extensive business, much of which, by the recent enactments, had become contraband, and it was, therefore, his duty to suppress it. They had dealings with Spain, France, Portugal, Holland, the Canaries, and even with Guinea and Madagascar, and they had accumulated considerable wealth. Josselyn, who was in Massachusetts a few years before the arrival of Randolph, the custom-house officer appointed for the North, says, that some merchants were " damnable rich " ; and Dunton, who followed him about twenty years afterwards, speaks of a lady who came over from England, " with the valuable venture of her beautiful person, which went off at an extraordinary rate, she marrying a merchant in Salem worth nearly thirty thousand pound." Between the visits of these quaint chroniclers, the commissioners of Charles had come on their inglorious errand, and they made report of the general wealth of the Colony acquired by trade.

A commercial spirit existed elsewhere ; and as every Colony had some share in the traffic which was to be checked, or, if possible, to be entirely broken up, none were disposed to submit quietly to the measures which were meant to effect either of these purposes. It is true, as is stated in the ex-

tract, that "the assemblies of Virginia and Maryland recognized the collectors as legal officers"; but difficulties arose in both Colonies, though neither of them possessed a considerable town or mart of trade. In the former, earnest complaints were made against the Act of Navigation, and the restraints imposed upon commerce generally. In Bacon's harangues to the people, these topics were not forgotten; and one of the objects to be gained by those who followed him into open rebellion was to "build ships, and, like New England, to trade to any part of the world." Towards the close of the century, seven collectors and naval-officers, all of whom were members of Andros's council, were found stationed in different parts of the Colony, and, in form at least, the Navigation Act and the kindred laws were afterwards observed. But though the declaration, that Virginia had long acquiesced in the acts restrictive of her commerce, occurs in her instructions to her delegates to the first Continental Congress, it may well be doubted whether the submission was more than nominal, or much as it was in other Colonies; since there is evidence to show that many of the king's revenue-officers were great traffickers, and were as unscrupulous as others who bought, sold, and shipped commodities. So in Maryland, there was a strenuous opposition to the establishment of a custom-house and the presence of a collector, whereby Lord Baltimore was involved in great difficulties, and his chartered rights were endangered. During the controversy, Rousby, the collector, was killed.

In North Carolina, the attempt to promote a more lawful trade, and the dispute with a New England trader as to the entry of his vessel and the payment of the king's duties, was one of the causes of an insurrection, which resulted in deposing and imprisoning Miller, the collector. In South Carolina, illicit traffic continued to be carried on, notwithstanding the presence and exertions of Muschamp, the royal officer of the customs; and opposition to his authority caused much tumult and disorder. In New York, Dyer, the Duke of York's collector, was indicted for performing his official duty; and the rebellion a few years afterwards, promoted by Leisler, — a wealthy merchant, who owned ships which he sent to Europe, and who lost his life, on the restoration of the lawful government, for the part he had taken in subverting it, — originated partly in the disputes that arose with the

principal officers of the revenue. In New Jersey, the collector was thwarted by the people who formed the juries, when prosecutions were commenced against smugglers ; while the quarrels between the officers of that Colony and of New York, as to the right of entering and clearing vessels, added to the disturbances, and the seizures and condemnations which followed, produced great commotion.

In New England, the royal collector, surveyor, and searcher, as Randolph was called, encountered obstacles that would have subdued the spirit of any other man. Determined upon success, he made eight voyages to America during the nine years which connect his name with our subject. His instructions were dated from the "Custom-house, London, July 9, 1678," and affixed to them are the signatures of Ed. Dering, Ch. Cheyne, and G. Downing. These instructions were long and tediously minute, being arranged under nineteen distinct heads. They were evidently framed by one who was thoroughly acquainted with the course of Colonial trade, and perhaps by Downing himself. The offences for which ships and cargoes might be seized were very numerous. He was furnished with a number of documents, copies of which were probably given to all officers engaged in the same business with himself. Among these papers were the "Act of Tonnage and Poundage," the "Act of Navigation," that for "preventing Fraud," for "Encouragement of Trade," for "The better regulating the Plantation Trade," and for "The better securing the Plantation Trade. He was directed, moreover, to settle his "usual residence in the port of Boston, in Massachusetts Colonye," and to appoint one deputy at least in the "Colonyes of Plymouth, Connecticut, Rhode Island, the Province of Mayne, and New Hampshire."

Such was the mission of the first royal officer of the customs who appeared among the Roundheads of Boston. He was a doomed man before his arrival. The vessels which were seized by him and his deputies were rescued ; the subordinates were fined by the Colonial courts for their officious zeal ; and the principal, after enduring every indignity, was at last imprisoned. In a letter to Lord Clarendon, written from Boston, in 1682, he says, "I humbly beseech your Lordship, that I may have consideration for all my losses and money laid out in prosecuting seizures here." The same

year, he wrote to the Bishop of London : " I have a great fammyly to mayntayne, have had great losses and expences about his Majesties service here." To a Mr. Povey, in 1687, he says : " I am at 50 £ a year charge to keep an able clerke, and cannot get any fees settled sufficient to pay that charge." In a letter dated from the " Gaol in Boston," to the governor of Barbadoes, he thus writes : " The countrey is poor, the exact execution of the acts of trade hath much impoverished them : *all the blame lyes upon me, who first attacked and then overthrew their charter*, and was made the officer to continue their Egyptian servitude, by my office of collector." Again, and from his dungeon, he implored Cooke, his old enemy, to take from his apartment a wounded fellow-prisoner, whose sores had become insupportably offensive. The commercial orders of Sir Edmund Andros, who was sent to govern New England after the charter of Massachusetts was vacated, were as rigid as those of Randolph. He was deposed, and then the attempt rigidly to enforce these orders ended.

Such was the result of the *first* effort to fasten the Navigation Act and the Laws of Trade upon the American Colonies. It was hoped that the second attempt, made nearly a century afterwards, would be more successful ; but it terminated more disastrously than the former one. Separation from the mother country would have followed the one as certainly as it did the other, if there had been the same strength and concert, the same deeply seated irritation, caused by often repeated and long continued wrongs, and the same aid from the state of English and European politics. There never was a period, early or late, when the maritime Colonies would have submitted willingly to the requirements of these statutes, or when their influence would not have caused opposition to them to be made in the other Colonies. Whoever carefully traces the course of events for the fifteen years immediately following 1676 will discover a most striking resemblance to those which occurred between 1761 and the commencement of hostilities. The periods of the introduction and the expulsion of royal collectors of the customs are alike memorable epochs in our annals.

After narrating at some length the events which preceded the war between England and Spain, in 1739, Chalmers says, that the object of the war was " partly to avenge the

supposed depredations of Spain, but more to protect Georgia from invasion, and to establish for Carolina a barrier." * Reverse the statement, and we come much nearer to the truth ; a writer who so frequently and severely condemns the illicit traffic of the Northern Colonies should have given the causes and objects of this war more accurately. The fact was, British subjects carried on an extensive contraband trade with the Spanish possessions, which Spain earnestly insisted upon checking or wholly suppressing. In the effort, it was alleged, she interrupted not only the unlawful commerce of British merchants, but that also which was legal ; and from this dispute principally, if not entirely, originated the appeal to arms. The desire to protect Georgia and to establish for Carolina a barrier was hardly among the leading pretexts for hostile measures, and had little or no share in really producing them. If British smugglers had not been molested, peace would have been preserved. The war was alike unnecessary and dishonorable.

We here conclude our hasty comments upon the work of this zealous friend and supporter of the prerogative, with commending it to our readers as well worthy of perusal, and even of diligent study. We cannot learn too much of American history ; and the publication of works relating to it, which contain original and valuable materials, ought to be encouraged, though, as in the present case, they also contain sentiments that are illiberal and unjust. It is only by reading both sides of the controversy which severed us from the parent stock, that the real issues can be certainly and fully ascertained. As this history ends with the reign of George the Second, the question as to the origin and effects of the agreements of non-importation, of the committees of correspondence, and of the Continental Congress, which were the three great engines that were used to tear up the framework of the Colonial system in the American Colonies, does not fairly come before us for consideration. It was a great disappointment to us, to find that our loyalist writer gives no account of the transactions of the fifteen years which immediately preceded the war. A digest prepared by him of the correspondence of the royal governors of the several Colonies with the ministry during that time would have had great

* Vol. II., p. 185.

interest. But as the writings of the losers in the strife continue to multiply, we may hope that something will appear at a future time to supply the deficiency. Would that each of the representatives of the crown, like Hutchinson, had written out his opinion of the men and measures that he resisted ! Cooke of Rhode Island, and Trumbull of Connecticut, were sound Whigs ; but with what avidity would the curious inquirer into the things of the past read narratives of the difficulties and embarrassments of Wentworth, Tryon, and Franklin, of Penn, Eden, Dunmore, and Martin, written out by their own hands !

ART. V. — *Theory of Morals : an Inquiry concerning the Law of Moral Distinctions and the Variations and Contradictions of Ethical Codes*. BY RICHARD HILDRETH. Boston : Charles C. Little and James Brown. 1844. 12mo. pp. 272.

“ SEVERAL of my characters,” says the author of “ Ten Thousand a Year,” “ may be looked on as reptiles of a low order in the scale of being, whose simple structures almost one dash of the knife would suffice to lay thoroughly open. Gammon, however, I look upon as of a much higher order, possessing a far more complicated structure, adapted to the discharge of superior functions ; and who, consequently, requireth a more careful dissection.” The distinction here indicated applies emphatically to bad books. Some need but a single dash of the knife, and are not worth even that ; but combine weakness and wickedness in such happy proportions, that the reviewer may safely let them crawl unmolested to oblivion. The book before us is of a higher order ; it has many of the properties of a good book ; it is grave, decent, dignified, in its tone and manner ; it purports to be a truly philosophical work ; but its reasoning is all vitiated by the assumption of false premises, and its sober, didactic style is made the vehicle for conveying the most licentious sentiments in morals and theology.

Yet in some quarters this book will do good. The *reductio ad absurdum* is a mode of reasoning no less applicable